

## Unit 5. Regression and Correlation

*“ ‘Don’t let us quarrel,’ the White Queen said in an anxious tone. ‘What is the cause of lightning?’ ‘The cause of lightning,’ Alice said very decidedly, for she felt quite certain about this, ‘is the thunder-oh no!’ she hastily corrected herself. ‘I meant the other way.’ ‘It’s too late to correct it,’ said the Red Queen: ‘when you’ve once said a thing, that fixes it, and you must take the consequences.’ “*  
- Carroll

Menopause heralds a complex interplay of hormonal and physiologic changes. Some are temporary discomforts (e.g., hot flashes, sleep disturbances, depression). Others are long-term changes that increase the risk of significant chronic health conditions, bone loss and osteoporosis in particular. Recent observations of an association between **depressive symptoms** and **low bone mineral density (BMD)** raise the intriguing possibility that alleviation of depression might confer a risk benefit with respect to bone mineral density loss and osteoporosis.

However, the finding of an association in a simple (one predictor) linear regression model analysis has multiple possible explanations, only one of which is causal. Others include, but are not limited to: (1) the apparent association is an artifact of the confounding effects of exercise, body fat, education, smoking, etc; (2) there is no relationship and we have observed a chance event of low probability (it can happen!); (3) the pathway is the other way around (low BMD causes depressive symptoms), albeit highly unlikely; and/or (4) the finding is spurious due to study design flaws (selection bias, misclassification, etc).

In settings where multiple, related predictors are associated with the outcome of interest, multiple predictor linear regression analysis allows us to study the joint relationships among the multiple predictors (depressive symptoms, exercise, body fat, etc) and a single continuous outcome (BMD).

In this example, we might be especially interested in using multiple predictor linear regression to isolate the effect of depressive symptoms on BMD, holding all other predictors constant (**adjustment**). Or, we might want to investigate the possibility of synergism or **interaction**.

## Table of Contents

Topic	Learning Objectives .....	3
	1. <u>Review</u> .....	4
	a. Settings Where Regression Might be Considered .....	4
	b. Review - What is Statistical Modeling .....	7
	c. A General Approach for Model Development .....	8
	d. Review - Normal Theory Regression .....	9
	2. <u>R Users</u> Illustration - Fit a Simple Linear Regression Model .....	12
	3. <u>Multivariable Regression</u> .....	14
	a. Introduction .....	14
	b. Indicator and Design Variables .....	17
	c. Interaction Variables .....	20
	d. <b>Look!</b> Schematic of Confounding and Effect Modification .....	21
	e. The Analysis of Variance Table .....	22
	f. The Partial F Test .....	25
	g. Multiple Partial Correlation .....	27
	4. <u>Multivariable Model Development</u> .....	29
	a. Introduction .....	29
	b. Example – Framingham Study .....	30
	c. Suggested Criteria for Confounding and Interaction .....	37
	d. Additional Tips for Multivariable Analyses of Large Data Sets .....	38
	5. <u>Goodness-of-Fit and Regression Diagnostics</u> .....	40
	a. Introduction and Terminology.....	40
	b. Assessment of Normality.....	47
	c. Cook-Weisberg Test of Heteroscedasticity .....	51
	d. Method of Fractional Polynomials .....	52
	e. Ramsay Test for Omitted Variables .....	54
	f. Residuals, Leverage, & Cook's Distance .....	55
	g. Example – Framingham Study .....	57

<b>Datasets used</b> (download from course website) janka.Rdata p53paper.Rdata framingham_1000.Rdata	<b>Packages used</b> (one time installation required) ggplot2      Hmisc stargazer    car gridExtra    lmtest GGally       summarytools  <b>Tip!</b> Don't forget that R is case sensitive ...
---	--

## 1. Learning Objectives

When you have finished this unit, you should be able to:

- Explain the concepts of association, causation, confounding, mediation, and effect modification;
- Construct and interpret a scatter plot with respect to: evidence of association, assessment of linearity, and the presence of outlying values;
- State the multiple predictor linear regression model and the assumptions necessary for its use;
- Perform and interpret the Shapiro-Wilk and Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests of normality;
- Explain the relevance of the normal probability distribution;
- Explain and interpret the coefficients (and standard error) and analysis of variance tables outputs of a single or multiple predictor regression model estimation;
- Explain and compare crude versus adjusted estimates (betas) of association;
- Explain and interpret regression model estimates of effect modification (interaction);
- Explain and interpret overall and adjusted R-squared measures of association;
- Explain and interpret overall and partial F-tests;
- Draft an analysis plan for a multiple predictor regression model analysis; and
- Explain and interpret selected regression model diagnostics: residuals, leverage, and Cook's distance.

## 1. Review

Simple linear regression and correlation were introduced in [BIOSTATS 540, Unit 12](#).

### a. Settings Where Regression Might Be Considered

#### Example #1

Is the density of wood a predictor of hardness of timber?

Source:

Williams, E.J. (1959) Regression Analysis, New York: John Wiley & Sons

Wood density and timber hardness are two different things, with timber hardness being important in many of the products of wood processing. Wood density is pounds of weight per cubic foot of volume, while timber hardness is measure of force. One measure of the latter is the Janka Scale; it defines hardness as the number of pounds required to push a ball bearing into a timber sample using a machine press. So, as you might imagine, it might be of interest to estimate the parameters that define the relationship between the two so as to obtain a **prediction equation**. Thus, in this example, the predictor (explanatory variable) is wood density and the outcome (response variable) is the Janka Scale hardness score:

Y = hardness

X = density

#### Example #2

Does the expression of p53 change with parity and age?

Source:

Matthews et al. Parity Induced Protection Against Breast Cancer 2007.

P53 is a human gene that is a tumor suppressor gene. Malfunctions of this gene have been implicated in the development and progression of many cancers, including breast cancer. Matthews et al were interested in **exploring the relationship** of Y=p53 expression to parity and age at first pregnancy, after adjustment for other, established, risk factors for breast cancer, including: age at first mensis, family history of breast cancer, menopausal status, and history of oral contraceptive use.

- Among the initial analyses, a **simple linear regression** might be performed to obtain a thorough understanding of the relationship of p53 expression and age. Both the outcome (Y) and the predictor (X) are continuous.

Y = p53 expression

X = Age

- A **multiple linear regression** might then be performed to see if age and parity retain their predictive significance, after controlling for the other, known, risk factors for breast cancer. Thus, the analysis would consider one outcome variable (Y) and 6 predictor variables (X<sub>1</sub>, X<sub>2</sub>, X<sub>3</sub>, X<sub>4</sub>, X<sub>5</sub>, X<sub>6</sub>):

Y = p53  
X<sub>1</sub> = Age  
X<sub>2</sub> = Parity  
X<sub>3</sub> = Age at first mensis  
X<sub>4</sub> = Family history of breast cancer  
X<sub>5</sub> = Menopausal status  
X<sub>6</sub> = History of oral contraceptive use

### Example #3

#### Does Air Pollution Reduce Lung Function?

##### Source:

Detels et al (1979) *The UCLA population studies of chronic obstructive respiratory disease. I. Methodology and comparison of lung function in areas of high and low pollution. Am. J. Epidemiol. 109: 33-58.*

Detels et al (1979) investigated the relationship of lung function to exposure to air pollution among residents of Los Angeles in the 1970's. Baseline and follow-up measurements of exposure and lung function were obtained. Also obtained were measurements of selected other variables that the investigators suspected might confound or modify the effects of pollution on lung function: age, sex, height, weight, etc. Afifi, Clark and May (2004) consider portions of this data in their 2004 text, *Computer-Aided Multivariate Analysis, Fourth Edition* (Chapman & Hall)

- A **simple linear regression** might be performed to characterize the relationship between FEV and height:

Y = FEV, liters  
X = Height, inches

- A **multiple linear regression** might then be performed to determine the nature and strength of exposure to pollution for the prediction of lung function, taking into account the roles of other influences on lung function, such as age, height, smoking, etc. For example, the relationship of lung function to exposure to air pollution might be different for smokers and non-smokers; this would be an example of effect modification (interaction). It might also be the case that the relationship of lung function to exposure to air pollution is confounded by height. Here, we would have something like:

Y = FEV, liters  
X<sub>1</sub> = Exposure to air pollution  
X<sub>2</sub> = Height, inches  
X<sub>3</sub> = Smoking (1=yes, 0=no)

**Example #4****Exercise and Glucose for the Prevention of Diabetes**Source:

Hulley et al (1998) *Randomized trial of estrogen plus progestin for secondary prevention of heart disease in postmenopausal women. The Heart and Estrogen/progestin Study. JAMA 280(7): 605-13.*

In the HERS study, Hulley et al. (1998) sought to determine if exercise, a modifiable behavior, might lower the risk of diabetes in non-diabetic women who are at risk of developing the disease. The question is a complex one because there are many risk factors for diabetes. Moreover, the type of woman who chooses to exercise may be related in other ways to risk of diabetes, apart from the fact of her exercise habit. For example, women who exercise regularly are typically younger and have lower body mass index (BMI); these characteristics also confer a risk benefit with respect to diabetes. Finally, the benefit of exercise may be mediated through a reduction of body mass index. Vittinghoff, Glidden, Shiboski and McCulloch (2005) consider portions of this data in their 2005 text, *Regression Methods in Biostatistics: Linear, Logistic, Survival and Repeated Measures Models* (Springer).

- A **multiple linear regression** was performed to assess the benefit of exercising at least three times/week, compared to no exercise, on blood glucose, after controlling for other factors associated with blood glucose levels. Thus, here we would have something like:

$Y = \text{Glucose, mg/dL}$

$X_1 = \text{Exercise (1=yes if 3x/week or more, 0 = no)}$

$X_2 = \text{Age, years}$

$X_3 = \text{Body Mass Index (BMI)}$

$X_4 = \text{Alcohol Use (1=yes, 0=no)}$

## b. Review - What is Statistical Modeling

George E.P. Box, a very famous statistician, once said, “*All models are wrong, but some are useful.*” Incorrectness notwithstanding, we do statistical modeling for a very good reason. We seek an understanding of the natures and strengths of the relationships (if any) that might exist in a set of observations that vary.

For any set of observations, theoretically, lots of models are possible. So, how to choose? The **goal** of statistical modeling is to obtain a model that is simultaneously **minimally adequate** and a **good fit**. **The model should also make sense.**

### Minimally adequate

- Each predictor is “important” in its own right
- Each extra predictor is retained in the model only if it yields a significant improvement (in fit and in variation explained).
- The model should not contain any redundant parameters.

### Good Fit

- The amount of variability in the outcomes (the Y variable) explained is a lot
- The outcomes that are predicted by the model are close to what was actually observed.

### The model should also make sense

- A preferred model is one based on “subject matter” considerations
- The preferred predictors are the ones that are simply and conveniently measured.

It is not possible to choose a model that is simultaneously minimally adequate and a perfect fit.  
Model estimation and selection must achieve an appropriate balance.

## ntc. A General Approach for Model Development

There are ***no*** rules ***nor a single best strategy***. Different study designs and research questions call for different approaches. Tip – Before you begin your model development, make a list of your study design, research aims, outcome variable, primary predictor(s), and covariates. As a general suggestion, the following approach has the advantages of providing a reasonably thorough exploration of the data and relatively small risk of missing something important.

**Preliminary** – Be sure you have: (1) checked, cleaned and described your data, (2) screened the data for multivariable associations, and (3) thoroughly explored the bivariate relationships.

### Step 1 – Fit the “maximal” model.

The maximal model is the large model that contains all the explanatory variables of interest as predictors. This model also contains all the covariates that might be of interest. It also contains all the interactions that might be of interest. Note the amount of variation explained.

### Step 2 – Begin simplifying the model.

Inspect each of the terms in the “maximal” model with the goal of removing the predictor that is the least significant. Drop from the model the predictors that are the least significant, beginning with the higher order interactions (***Tip*** -interactions are complicated and we are aiming for a simple model). Fit the reduced model. Compare the amount of variation explained by the reduced model with the amount of variation explained by the “maximal” model.

If the deletion of a predictor has little effect on the variation explained ....  
Then leave that predictor out of the model.

And inspect each of the terms in the model again.

If the deletion of a predictor has a significant effect on the variation explained ...  
Then put that predictor back into the model.

### Step 3 – Keep simplifying the model.

Repeat step 2, over and over, until the model remaining contains nothing but significant predictor variables.

### Beware of some important caveats

- Sometimes, you will want to keep a predictor in the model regardless of its statistical significance (an example is randomization assignment in a clinical trial)
- The order in which you delete terms from the model matters!
- You still need to be flexible to considerations of biology and what makes sense.




# d. Review - Normal Theory Regression

Normal theory regression analysis can be used to model/investigate possibly complex relationships when:

- The outcome is a **single continuous variable (Y)** that is assumed to be **distributed normal**; and
- The outcome is potentially related to possibly **several predictor variables ( $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_p$ )** which can be **continuous or discrete**; and
- Some of the predictor variables might **confound** the prediction role of other explanatory variables; and
- Some of the predictor-outcome relationships may be different (are **modified** by) depending on the level of one or more different predictor variables (**interaction**)

## Simple Linear Regression:

A simple linear regression model is one for which the mean  $\mu$  (the average value) of **one continuous, and normally distributed, outcome** random variable  $Y$  (e.g.  $Y = \text{FEV}$  for forced expiratory volume) varies linearly with changes in **one continuous predictor** variable  $X$  (e.g.  $X = \text{Height}$ ). It says that the expected values of the outcome  $Y$ , as  $X$  changes, lie on a straight line ("regression line").



Here,  $\sigma^2_{y|x_1} = \sigma^2_{y|x_2} = \sigma^2_{y|x_3} = \sigma^2_{y|x_4}$

## Assumptions of Simple Linear Regression

1. The outcomes  $Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n$  are **independent**.
2. The values of the predictor variable  $X$  are fixed and measured without error.
3. At each value of the predictor variable  $X=x$ , the distribution of the outcome  $Y$  is **normal** with

$$\begin{aligned}\text{mean} &= \mu_{Y|X=x} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x \\ \text{variance} &= \sigma_{Y|x}^2.\end{aligned}$$

## Model

These assumptions say that we are modeling the observed outcome for the  $i$ th subject as the sum of two pieces: 1) a model piece; plus 2) an error piece.

Observed for " $i$ "th subject = [Systematic or Predicted for " $i$ "] + [Error or Departure from Predicted for " $i$ "]

that is:

$$Y_i = [\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_i] + \epsilon_i$$

1. The errors  $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_n$  are **independent**.
2. Each error  $\epsilon_i$  is distributed is **normal** with

$$\begin{aligned}\text{mean} &= 0 \\ \text{variance} &= \sigma_{Y|x}^2.\end{aligned}$$

## “Least Squares”, “Close” and Least Squares Estimation

Theoretically, it is possible to draw many lines through an  $X$ - $Y$  scatter of points. Which to choose? “Least squares” estimation is one approach to choosing a line that is “closest” to the data.

We choose values for  $\hat{\beta}_0$  and  $\hat{\beta}_1$  that, upon insertion, minimizes the total

$$\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \hat{Y}_i)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - [\hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 X_i])^2$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \hat{Y}_i)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \left( Y_i - [\hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 X_i] \right)^2 \text{ has a variety of names:}$$

- ◆ residual sum of squares, SSE or SSQ(residual)
- ◆ sum of squares about the regression line
- ◆ sum of squares due error (SSE)

### Least Squares Estimation Solutions

Note – the estimates are denoted either using Greek letters with a caret or with Roman letters

<b>Estimate of Slope</b> $\hat{\beta}_1$ or $b_1$	$\hat{\beta}_1 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})(Y_i - \bar{Y})}{\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2}$
<b>Intercept</b> $\hat{\beta}_0$ or $b_0$	$\hat{\beta}_0 = \bar{Y} - \hat{\beta}_1 \bar{X}$

### Analysis of Variance

Partitioning the Total Variance and all things sum of squares and mean squares

Source	df	Sum of Squares <i>A measure of variability</i>	Mean Square = Sum of Squares / df <i>A measure of average/typical/mean variability</i>
Regression due model	1	$SSR = \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{Y}_i - \bar{Y})^2$	MSR = SSR/1
Residual due error	(n-2)	$SSE = \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \hat{Y}_i)^2$	MSE = SSE/(n-2) = $\hat{\sigma}_{Y X}^2$ Note: also called “mean squared error”
Total, corrected	(n-1)	$SST = \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \bar{Y})^2$	

## 2.

## Illustration: Fit a Simple Linear Regression Model

Preliminary - Set working directory (change mine in yellow to yours)

```
setwd("/Users/cbigelow/Desktop/")

Input R dataset janka.Rdata. Inspect.
library(tidyverse)
load(file="janka.Rdata") # Assumes the data are in the working directory
janka$hardness <- as.numeric(janka$hardness)
glimpse(janka)

## Observations: 36
## Variables: 2
## $ density <dbl> 24.7, 24.8, 27.3, 28.4, 28.4, 29.0, 30.3, 32.7, 35.6, 3...
## $ hardness <dbl> 484, 427, 413, 517, 549, 648, 587, 704, 979, 914, 1070,...
```

janka


	density	hardness
## 1	24.7	484
## 2	24.8	427
## 3	27.3	413
## 4	28.4	517
...	Rows omitted ...	
## 34	68.8	2890
## 35	69.1	2740
## 36	69.1	3140

Descriptives using command `stargazer()` in package `stargazer`

```
library(stargazer)
stargazer::stargazer(data=janka,type="text",median=TRUE)
##
## =====
## Statistic N      Mean      St. Dev.  Min   Pctl(25) Median Pctl(75)  Max
## -----
## density   36  45.733    13.580  24.700  37.775  41.800  56.700  69.100
## hardness  36 1,469.472  801.517   413    962.8   1,195   1,980   3,260
## -----
```

Scatterplot using command `ggplot()` and option `geom_point()` in package `ggplot2`

```
library(ggplot2)
library(ggplot2)
ggplot(data=janka) + # specify dataset
  aes(x=density,y=hardness) + # define x- and y-axis
  geom_point() + # produce XY scatterplot
  xlab(expression("Wood Density, lb/ft"^{3})) + # Label the x-axis
  ylab("Timber Hardness, lb-force") + # Label the y-axis
  ggtitle("Simple Scatterplot")
```



### Fit Simple Linear Regression. Obtain Coefficients Table. Obtain Analysis of Variance Table

```
# KEY:
# lm( ) fits the model. Example: MODELNAME <- lm(data=DATAFRAME, YVARIABLE ~ XPREDICTOR)
# summary( ) provides coefficients table and some other info. Example: summary(MODELNAME)
# anova( ) produces anova table. Example: anova(MODELNAME)
```

```
model1 <- lm(data=janka, hardness~density)
summary(model1)
## lm(formula = hardness ~ density, data = janka)
##
## Residuals:
##      Min       1Q   Median       3Q      Max
## -338.40  -96.98  -15.71   92.71  625.06
##
## Coefficients:
##              Estimate Std. Error t value      Pr(>|t|)
## (Intercept)  -1160.500    108.580  -10.69  0.000000000000207 ***
## density         57.507      2.279   25.24 < 0.000000000000002 ***
## ---
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
##
## Residual standard error: 183.1 on 34 degrees of freedom
## Multiple R-squared:  0.9493, Adjusted R-squared:  0.9478
## F-statistic: 637 on 1 and 34 DF, p-value: < 0.0000000000000022
```

$$\text{Intercept} = \hat{\beta}_0 = b_0 = -1160.500$$

$$\text{Slope} = \hat{\beta}_1 = b_1 = 57.507$$

The fitted line is thus: Predicted hardness = hardness =  $-1160.500 + 57.507 \cdot \text{density}$

```
anova(model1)
## Analysis of Variance Table
##
## Response: hardness
##      Df    Sum Sq Mean Sq F value      Pr(>F)
## density  1 21345674 21345674  636.98 < 0.0000000000000022 ***
## Residuals 34  1139366    33511
## ---
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

SSQ(model) = SSR = 21,345,674  
 SSQ(residual) = SSE = 1,139,366  
 Overall F-test of null: slope=0  
 F = 636.98 with df = 1, 34  
 p-value <<< .0001 REJECT null  
 Conclude fitted line is significant

### 3. Multivariable Linear Regression

#### a. Introduction

In multiple linear regression, the number of explanatory (predictor) variables is  $> 1$ . There is still just one outcome (response) variable  $Y$ , continuous and assumed distributed normal. The multiple predictors in a linear regression model can be any mix of continuous or discrete.

#### Definition

A multiple linear regression model is a particular model of how the mean  $\mu$  (the average value) of **one continuous outcome random variable  $Y$**  (e.g.  $Y = \text{length of hospital stay}$ ) varies, depending on the value of two or more (these can be a mixture of continuous and discrete) predictor variables  $X$  (e.g.  $X_1 = \text{age}$ ,  $X_2 = 0/1 \text{ history of vertebral fractures, etc.}$ ). Specifically, it says that the average values of the outcome variable, as the profiles of predictors  $X_1$ ,  $X_2$ , ... etc change, lie on a “plane” (“regression plane”).

#### Example

P53 is a tumor suppressor gene that has been extensively studied in breast cancer research. Suppose we are interested in understanding the correlates of p53 expression, especially those that are known breast cancer risk variables. We might hypothesize that p53 expression is related to, among other things, number of pregnancies and age at first pregnancy.

$Y$  = p53 expression level  
 $X_1$  = number of pregnancies (coded 0, 1, 2, etc)  
 $X_2$  = age at first pregnancy  $\leq 24$  years (1=yes, 0=no)  
 $X_3$  = age at first pregnancy  $> 24$  years (1=yes, 0=no)

A multivariable linear model that relates  $Y$  to  $X_1$ ,  $X_2$ , and  $X_3$  is the following

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \text{error}$$

### The General Multivariable Linear Model

Similarly, it is possible to consider a multivariable model that includes  $p$  predictors:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \cdots + \beta_p X_p + \text{error}$$

- $p = \#$  predictors, apart from the intercept
- Each  $X_1 \cdots X_p$  can be either discrete or continuous.
- Data are comprised of  $n$  data points of the form  $(Y_i, X_{1i}, \cdots, X_{pi})$   
Note: The subscript “ $i$ ” is indexing the individual, while  $1, 2, \dots, p$  is indexing the predictor
- For the  $i^{\text{th}}$  individual, we have a vector of predictor variable values that is represented  $X'_i = [X_{1i}, X_{2i}, \dots, X_{pi}]$

### Assumptions

The assumptions required are an extension of those for simple linear regression.

1. The sample size =  $n$  separate observations  $Y_1, Y_2, \cdots, Y_n$  are **independent**.
2. The values of the predictor variables  $X_1 \cdots X_p$  are **fixed** and measured without error.
3. For each vector value of the predictor variable  $\underline{X}=\underline{x}$ , the distribution of values of  $Y$  follows a **normal** distribution with mean equal to  $\mu_{Y|\underline{X}=\underline{x}}$  and common variance equal to  $\sigma_{Y|\underline{x}}^2$ .
4. For each profile of values,  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_p$ , of the  $p$  predictor variables  $X_1 \cdots X_p$  (written using vector notation  $\underline{X}=\underline{x}$ ), the distribution of values of  $Y$  is **normal** with


$$\text{mean} = \mu_{Y|\underline{X}=\underline{x}} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \cdots + \beta_p X_p$$

$$\text{variance} = \sigma_{Y|\underline{X}=\underline{x}}^2.$$

## Model Fitting (Estimation)

When there are multiple predictors, the least squares fit is **multi-dimensional**. In the setting of just 2 predictors, it's possible to show a schematic of the fitted plane that results from least squares estimation.

In the picture below, the outcome (dependent variable) is  $Y$ =body length and there are two predictors:  $X_1$ =glabella length and  $X_2$ =glabella width. The purple ellipse is the least squares fit and is a **2-dimensional plane** in 3-dimensional space; it is the analogue of the straight line fit that was explained in simple linear regression.



Source: [www.palass.org](http://www.palass.org)



## b. Indicator Variables (also called “dummy variables”) and Design Variables

### Why Indicator Variables?

**Example** - Suppose you wanted to model some outcome ( $Y$  = duration of stay in ICU, in days) in relationship to type of surgery  $X$  with  $X$  coded as follows: 1=medical therapy, 2=angioplasty, and 3=coronary bypass surgery).

You just forge on and fit a simple linear model. **Spoiler alert – the following would be incorrect):**

$$\text{days}_i = [\beta_0 + \beta_1 * (\text{type of surgery})_i] + \varepsilon_i$$

The notion of slope representing the change in  $Y$ =days per 1 unit increase in  $X$ =type of surgery doesn't work!

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_1 &= \Delta Y \text{ per 1 unit increase in } X, \text{ by definition} \\ &= \text{Predicted change in duration of stay in ICU per 1 unit increase in TYPE OF SURGERY???} \\ &= \text{"makes no sense"}\end{aligned}$$

So, what to do? Answer: 1) we will NOT put  $X$ =type of surgery into the model; and 2) instead, we will substitute a set of what are called indicator variables, as described below.

### Introduction to Indicator Variables.

Indicator variables are commonly used as predictors in multivariable regression models. We let

$$\begin{aligned}1 &= \text{value of indicator when “trait” is present} \\ 0 &= \text{value of indicator when “trait” is not present}\end{aligned}$$

- ◆ The estimated regression coefficient  $\beta$  associated with an indicator variable has a straightforward interpretation, namely:
- ◆  $\beta$  = predicted change in outcome  $Y$  that accompanies presence of “trait”

### Examples of Simple Indicator Variables

SEXF = 1 if individual is female  
0 otherwise

TREAT = 1 if individual received experimental treatment  
0 otherwise

**When the Nominal Predictor has MORE THAN 2 Possibilities, the set of 0/1 indicator variables are called Design Variables.**

If a nominal variable has  $k$  possible values,  $(k-1)$  indicator variables are needed to distinguish the entire range of possibilities.

### Returning to our Example (Y=duration of stay in ICU, X = type of surgery)

Our original predictor variable X is nominal with 3 possible values:

X = 1 if treatment is medical therapy  
 2 if treatment is angioplasty  
 3 if treatment is bypass surgery

So, we've agreed that we cannot put X = type of surgery into a regression model "as is" because the resulting estimated slope makes no sense. Instead, we will put into the model TWO 0/1 indicator variables. One is a "flag" of angioplasty. The other is a "flag" of bypass surgery. Folks receiving medical therapy are then those for whom NEITHER flag occurs. For example, we might include the following set:

TR\_ANG = 1 if treatment is angioplasty (X=2)  
 0 otherwise

TR\_SUR = 1 if treatment is bypass surgery (X=3)  
 0 otherwise

A set of design variables comprised of  $(3-1) = 2$  indicator variables summarize three possible values of treatment. The reference category is medical therapy.

Value of Original Predictor X	Value of 0/1 Indicator TR_ANG	Value of 0/1 Indicator TR_SUR
X=1 ("medical"), the "referent"	0	0
X=2 ("angioplasty")	1	0
X=3 ("surgery")	0	1

### Guidelines for the Definition of Indicator and Design Variables

1) Consider the choice of the referent group.

Often this choice will be straightforward. It might be one of the following categories of values of the nominal variable:

- The unexposed
- The placebo
- The standard
- The most frequent

2) K levels of the nominal predictor  $\rightarrow$  (K-1) indicator variables

When the number of levels of the nominal predictor variable = k, define (k-1) indicator variables that will identify persons in each of the separate groups, apart from the reference group.

3) In general (this is not hard and fast), treat the (k-1) design variables as a set.

- Enter the set together
- Remove the set together
- In general, retain all (k-1) of the indicator variables, even when only a subset are significant.

### c. Interaction Variables

Sometimes the nature of an X-Y relationship is *different (meaning the slope is different)*, depending on the level of some third variable which, for now, we'll call Z. This is **interaction**. To capture how an X-Y relationship is "different" (or "modified by"), depending on the level of Z, we can define an **interaction variable** and then incorporate it as an additional predictor in the model.

Interaction of predictor X with third variable Z = XZ = X\*Z

**Example:** Y = length of stay  
X = age (years)  
Z = 0/1 indicator of history of vertebral fracture (Z=0 for NON fractures and Z=1 for fractures)  
XZ = [ X ] \* [ Z ] = interaction of X and Z

Our full model is thus the following:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Z + \beta_2 X + \beta_3 XZ$$

Key to the betas:

$\beta_0$  = intercept for **referent** (the referent group are patients with Z = 0, the non-vertebral fracture folks)  
 $\beta_1$  = **CHANGE in INTERCEPT** (associated with Z=1, that is - associated with vertebral fracture)  
 $\beta_2$  = slope of change in Y per unit X for **referent** group  
 $\beta_3$  = **CHANGE in SLOPE** associated with Z=1 (that is - associated with vertebral fracture)

What does the model become when Z=0?

This yields the model for the non-vertebral fractures patients. Insertion of Z=0 yields

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_2 X$$

$$\text{Intercept} = \beta_0$$

$$\text{Slope} = \beta_2$$

What does the model become when Z=1.

This yields the model for the **vertebral fractures** patients. Insertion of Z=1 yields

$$Y = [\beta_0 + \beta_1] + [\beta_2 + \beta_3]X$$

$$\text{Intercept} = [\beta_0 + \beta_1]$$

$$\text{Slope} = [\beta_2 + \beta_3]$$

# d. *Look!* Schematic of Confounding and Effect Modification

The tools of indicator variables and interaction variables are helpful (but not without important caveats) in exploring the data for evidence of confounding and effect modification.

Consider a similar regression setting:





Y = length of hospital stay

X = duration of surgery, continuous

Z = a nominal predictor coded 0 for “no comorbidities” and coded 1 for “one or more comorbidities”.

Associated with Z=1 (the patient has comorbidities), relative to Z=0 (the referent patient with no comorbidities), the X-Y relationship might have a different intercept, or a different slope, or a different intercept and a different slope.

Take a look!

			
<b>Coincident</b>	<b>Confounding (admittedly extreme!)</b>	<b>Effect Modification</b>	<b>Effect Modification</b>
$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X$	$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X + \beta_2 Z$	$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X + \beta_2 XZ$ where $XZ = X * Z$	$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X + \beta_2 Z + \beta_3 XZ$ where $XZ = X * Z$
<b>Comorbidities=0:</b> $Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X$	<b>Comorbidities=0:</b> $Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X$	<b>Comorbidities=0:</b> $Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X$	<b>Comorbidities=0:</b> $Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X$
<b>Comorbidities=1:</b> $Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X$	<b>Comorbidities=1:</b> $Y = (\beta_0 + \beta_2) + \beta_1 X$	<b>Comorbidities=1:</b> $Y = \beta_0 + (\beta_1 + \beta_2) X$	<b>Comorbidities=1:</b> $Y = (\beta_0 + \beta_2) + (\beta_1 + \beta_3) X$
	$\beta_2 = \text{change}$ in intercept associated with presence of any comorbidities	$\beta_2 = \text{change}$ in slope of Y on X associated with presence of any comorbidities	$\beta_2 = \text{change}$ in intercept $\beta_3 = \text{change}$ in slope of Y on X

## e. The Analysis of Variance Table

The ideas of the analysis of variance table introduced in BIOSTATS 540 (*Unit 12, Simple Linear Regression and Correlation*) apply here, as well.

### 1. **SST:** “Total” or “total, corrected”

◆  $SST = \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \bar{Y})^2$  is the variability of  $Y$  about  $\bar{Y}$

◆ Degrees of freedom =  $df = (n-1)$ .

### 2. **SSR** “Regression” or “due model”

◆  $SSR = \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{Y}_i - \bar{Y})^2$  is the variability of  $\hat{Y}$  about  $\bar{Y}$

◆ Degrees of freedom =  $df = p = \#$  predictors *apart* from intercept

### 3. **SSE:** “Residual” or “due error” refers to the

◆  $SSE = \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \hat{Y}_i)^2$  is the variability of  $Y$  about  $\hat{Y}$

◆ Degrees of freedom =  $df = (n-1) - (p)$

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Model	p	$SSR = \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{Y}_i - \bar{Y})^2$	$MSR = SSR/p$
Residual	$(n-1) - p$	$SSE = \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \hat{Y}_i)^2$	$MSE = SSE/(n-1-p)$
Total, corrected	$(n-1)$	$SST = \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \bar{Y})^2$	

## Overall F Test

The overall F test also applies, yielding an overall F-test to assess the significance of the variance explained by the model. Note that the degrees of freedom is different here; this is because there are now “p” predictors instead of 1 predictor.

$$H_0: \beta_1 = \beta_2 = \dots = \beta_p = 0$$

$$H_A: \text{At least one } \beta_i \neq 0$$

$$F_{\text{OVERALL}} = \frac{\text{mean square due model}}{\text{mean square due residual}} = \frac{\text{MSR}}{\text{MSE}} = \frac{\text{SSR}/(p)}{\text{SSE}/(n-1-p)} \quad \text{with df} = p, (n-1-p)$$

Rejection of the null occurs for large values of  $F_{\text{OVERALL}}$  with accompanying small p-value. With rejection of the null, we conclude at least one predictor (we don't know which ones) has a slope that is statistically significantly different from zero.

**Example -** Consider a multiple linear regression analysis of the relationship of  $Y = \text{p53 expression}$  to  $\text{age at first pregnancy (pregnum)}$ ,  $1^{\text{st}} \text{ pregnancy at age } \leq 24 \text{ (early)}$ , and  $1^{\text{st}} \text{ pregnancy at age } > 24 \text{ (late)}$ . The variables **early** and **late** are each 0/1. The referent group is nulliparous.

## R illustration

The following assumes that you have downloaded **p53paper.Rdata** from the course website

```
load(file="p53paper.Rdata")
fit <- lm(p53 ~ pregnum + early + late, data=p53paper)
summary(fit)
```

```
##
## Call:
## lm(formula = p53 ~ pregnum + early + late, data = p53paper)
##
## Residuals:
##      Min       1Q   Median       3Q      Max
## -2.86030 -0.57031  0.01611  0.51611  2.62100
##
## Coefficients:
##              Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
## (Intercept)   2.57031    0.24088   10.671 9.36e-16 ***
## pregnum       0.37641    0.20087    1.874  0.0656 .
## early         0.16076    0.55559    0.289  0.7733
## late        -0.06772    0.50174   -0.135  0.8931
## ---
## The fitted line is:   $\hat{p53} = 2.57 + 0.38 \cdot \text{pregnum} + 0.16 \cdot \text{early} - 0.07 \cdot \text{late}$ 
##
## Residual standard error: 0.9635 on 63 degrees of freedom
## (1 observation deleted due to missingness)
## Multiple R-squared:  0.203, Adjusted R-squared:  0.165
## F-statistic: 5.349 on 3 and 63 DF, p-value: 0.002402 The overall F-test of the null hypothesis of
## zero slopes on every predictor is rejected. Conclude at least one slope is statistically significantly
## different from zero.
```

```
anova(fit)

## Analysis of Variance Table
##
## Response: p53
##           Df Sum Sq Mean Sq F value    Pr(>F)
## pregnum    1 14.330  14.3301  15.4359 0.0002146 ***
## early       1  0.550   0.5497   0.5921 0.4444682
## late        1  0.017   0.0169   0.0182 0.8930686
## Residuals 63 58.487   0.9284
## ---
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

$H_0: \beta_{\text{PREGNUM}} = 0$  and  $\beta_{\text{EARLY}} = 0$  and  $\beta_{\text{LATE}} = 0$   
 $H_A$ : At least one slope  $\neq 0$

$$F_{3,63} = \frac{\text{mean square due model}}{\text{mean square due residual}} = \frac{\text{MSR}}{\text{MSE}} = \frac{\text{SSR}/(p)}{\text{SSE}/(n-1-p)}$$

$$F_{3,63} = \frac{\text{msq}(\text{Model})}{\text{msq}(\text{Residual})} = \frac{(14.330 + 0.550 + 0.017)/3}{(58.487)/63} = \frac{4.96557054}{0.9284} = 5.349$$

The overall F-test of the null hypothesis of zero slopes on every predictor is rejected (p-value = .002; see previous page). Conclude at least one slope is statistically significantly different from zero. Important: all we can say at this point, however, is that the model that was fit explains statistically significantly more of the variability in  $Y = p53$  than is explained by “no model” at all (the intercept only model).



### f. The Partial F Test

The partial F test is among our key tools in model development in multiple linear regression.

What if we want to compare and choose between two models?

The partial F test is a statistical technique for comparing two models that are “hierarchical.” It permits the assessment of associations while controlling for confounding.

What are hierarchical models?

- Hierarchical models are two models of a particular type. One model is called “smaller” or “reduced” or “reference”. The other model is called “larger” or “comparison.”
- “Hierarchical” means that all of the predictors in the smaller (reduced, reference) are contained in the larger (comparison) model.
- In the  $Y = p53$  example, we might be interested in comparing the following two hierarchical models:

Predictors in smaller model = { **pregnum** }

Predictors in larger model = { **pregnum** + **early** + **late** }

- “Hierarchical” is satisfied because all of the predictors (here there is just one - **pregnum**) that are contained in the smaller model are contained in the larger model.
- The important point to note is this. The comparison of these two models is an analysis of the nature and significance of the extra predictors, (here - **early** and **late**) for the prediction of  $Y = p53$ , adjusting for (controlling for) all of the variables in the smaller model (**pregnum**).

Thus, the comparison of the hierarchical models is addressing the following question:

What is the significance of **early** and **late** for the prediction of  $Y = p53$ , after controlling for the effects of **pregnum**?

### Statistical Definition of the Partial F Test

**Research Question:** Does inclusion of the “*extra*” predictors explain significantly more of the variability in outcome compared to the variability that is explained by the predictors that are already in the model?

#### Partial F Test

**H<sub>0</sub>:** Addition of  $X_{p+1} \dots X_{p+k}$  is of no statistical significance for the prediction of Y after controlling for the predictors  $X_1 \dots X_p$  meaning that:

$$\beta_{p+1} = \beta_{p+2} = \dots = \beta_{p+k} = 0 \text{ after adjustment for } X_1 \dots X_p$$

**H<sub>A</sub>:** Not

$$F_{\text{PARTIAL}} = \frac{\{ \text{Extra regression sum of squares} \} / \{ \text{Extra regression df} \}}{\{ \text{Residual sum of squares larger model} \} / \{ \text{Residual df larger model} \}}$$

$$= \frac{[SSR(X_1 \dots X_p, X_{p+1} \dots X_{p+k}) - SSR(X_1 \dots X_p)] / [(p+k) - p]}{[SSE(X_1 \dots X_p, X_{p+1} \dots X_{p+k})] / [(n-1) - (p+k)]}$$

$$\text{Numerator df} = (p+k) - (p) = k$$

$$\text{Denominator df} = (n-1) - (p+k)$$

#### H<sub>0</sub> true:

The extra predictors are not significant in adjusted analysis

F value = small  
p-value = large

#### H<sub>0</sub> false:

The extra predictors are significant in adjusted analysis

F value = large  
p-value = small

### R illustration Example – continued.

```
reduced <- lm(data=p53paper, p53 ~ pregnum)
full <- lm(data=p53paper, p53 ~ pregnum + early + late)
anova(reduced, full)
```

**H<sub>0</sub>:** Controlling for pregnum,  
 $\beta_{\text{EARLY}} = 0$  and  $\beta_{\text{LATE}} = 0$   
**H<sub>A</sub>:** At least one is of “ADDED” significance,  
after adjustment (controlling for) pregnum

#### Analysis of Variance Table

```
## Model 1: p53 ~ pregnum
## Model 2: p53 ~ pregnum + early + late
##   Res.Df    RSS Df Sum of Sq    F Pr(>F)
## 1      65 59.054
## 2      63 58.487  2   0.56663 0.3052 0.7381
```

telling us →  $F_{\text{partial}} = .3052$   $p\text{-value} = .7361$

The null hypothesis is NOT rejected (p-value = .74). Conclude that early and late are not predictive after adjustment for pregnum. Specifically, their addition to the model does not explain statistically significantly more of the variability in Y=p53 beyond that explained by pregnum.

## g. Multiple Partial Correlation

**Good to know.** The partial F test is a hypothesis test. In contrast, a partial correlation is a measure (expressed as a percent) of what is explained. The two are not the same thing!

A partial correlation addresses the question: *“To what extent is Y correlated with X (or multiple X), after accounting for some control variable Z (or multiple control variables Z)?*

One way to think about a partial correlation is to think along the following lines

- **Preliminary 1:** Regress the predictor X on the control variable Z
  - Obtain the residuals
  - These residuals represent the information in the predictor X that is independent of Z
- **Preliminary 2:** Now regress the outcome Y on the control variable Z
  - Obtain the residuals
  - These residuals represent the information in Y that is independent of Z
- The correlation between these two sets of residuals, correlation(residuals of Y on Z, residuals of X on Z) give you a Z-controlled assessment of the relationship between X and Y, that is, independent of Z.

Two ways to think about it.

Method 1 – as a correlation

**$R_{XY|Z}$  = Multiple Partial correlation (X,Y | controlling for Z)**

= Correlation (residuals of X regressed on Z, residuals of Y regressed on Z)

Method 2 – as a squared correlation

**$R^2_{XY|Z}$  = Multiple Squared Partial correlation (X,Y | controlling for Z)**

= 
$$\frac{\text{SSR}(\text{due Model with Z and X}) - \text{SSR}(\text{due Model with Z alone})}{\text{SSE}(\text{due residual in Z only model})}$$

Putting this all together, and keeping track of the distinctions ...

Partial F Test	Partial Multiple Correlation Squared
<b>Goal:</b> Hypothesis test of significance of extra variables, after adjustment for the control variables.	<b>Goal:</b> Estimation of percent of variability in outcome Y that is explained by the extra variables, independent of the control variables.
<b>Control variables:</b> $X_1 \dots X_p$ <b>Extra variables:</b> $X_{p+1} \dots X_{p+k}$	<b>Control variables:</b> $X_1 \dots X_p$ <b>Extra variables:</b> $X_{p+1} \dots X_{p+k}$
$F_{\text{PARTIAL}}$ hypothesis test compares <b>mean squares</b> to <b>mean squares</b>	$R^2_{\text{partial}}$ multiple partial correlation squared compares <b>sum of squares</b> to <b>sum of squares</b>
The denominator has the <b>FULL</b> model	The denominator has the <b>REDUCED</b> model
$= \frac{[SSR(X_1 \dots X_p, X_{p+1}, \dots, X_{p+k}) - SSR(X_1 \dots X_p)] / [(p+k) - p]}{[SSE(X_1 \dots X_p, X_{p+1}, \dots, X_{p+k})] / [(n-1) - (p+k)]}$	$= \frac{SSR(\text{due Model with all}) - SSR(\text{due Model control only})}{SSE(\text{due residual in Z only model})}$

## 4. Multivariable Model Development

### a. Introduction

Recall from page 7 .... The **goal** of statistical modeling is to obtain a model that is simultaneously **minimally adequate** and a **good fit**. **And the model should make sense.**

We also learned some general guidelines for how to proceed (**Take care. There is no single right answer !!**).

#### **Preliminary –**

Be sure you have: (1) checked, cleaned and described your data, (2) screened the data for multivariate associations, and (3) thoroughly explored the bivariate relationships.

#### **Step 1 –**

**Fit the “maximal” model.**

#### **Step 2 –**

**Begin simplifying the model.**

#### **Step 3 –**

**Keep simplifying the model.**

Repeat step 2, over and over, until the model remaining contains nothing but significant predictor variables.

#### **Then there is a Step 4 -**

**Perform regression diagnostics**

We'll get to this later, *Section 5. Goodness-of-Fit and Regression Diagnostics*

## b. Example

### Framingham Study

#### Source:

Levy (1999) National Heart Lung and Blood Institute. Center for Bio-Medical Communication.  
Framingham Heart Study

#### Description:

Cardiovascular disease (CVD) is the leading cause of death and serious illness in the United States. In 1948, the Framingham Heart Study - under the direction of the National Heart Institute (now known as the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute or NHLBI) was initiated. The objective of the Framingham Heart Study was to identify the common factors or characteristics that contribute to CVD by following its development over a long period of time in a large group of participants who had not yet developed overt symptoms of CVD or suffered a heart attack or stroke.

Here we use a subset of the data in a subset of  $n=1000$ .

Variable	Label	Codings
sbp	Systolic Blood Pressure (mm Hg)	
ln_sbp	Natural logarithm of sbp	$\ln\_sbp = \ln(sbp)$
age	Age, years	
bmi	Body Mass index (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	
ln_bmi	Natural logarithm of bmi	$\ln\_bmi = \ln(bmi)$
sex	Gender	1=male 2=female
female	Female Indicator	0 = male 1 = female
scl	Serum Cholesterol (mg/100 ml)	
ln_scl	Natural logarithm of scl	$\ln\_scl = \ln(scl)$

#### Multiple Regression Variables:

Outcome  $Y = \ln\_sbp$

Predictor Variables:  $\ln\_bmi$ ,  $\ln\_scl$ , age, sex

#### Research Question:

From among these 4 “candidate” predictors, what are the important “risk” factors and what is the nature of their association with  $Y = \ln\_sbp$ ?

# Input Data. Check. Produce descriptives:

```
# KEY:
# rm(list=ls()) clears the workspace

rm(list=ls())
setwd("/Users/cbigelow/Desktop/")

load(file="framingham_1000.Rdata")

# Dear class - I don't want to have to keep writing out Framingham_1000
# So I'm creating a new dataframe with a shorter name
framingham <- framingham_1000
```

```
summary(framingham)
```

```
##      sex      sbp      scl      age
## Men :443   Min.   : 80.0   Min.   :115.0   Min.   :30.00
## Women:557 1st Qu.:116.0   1st Qu.:197.0   1st Qu.:38.75
##      Median :128.0   Median :225.0   Median :45.00
##      Mean   :132.3   Mean   :227.8   Mean   :45.92
##      3rd Qu.:144.0   3rd Qu.:255.0   3rd Qu.:53.00
##      Max.   :270.0   Max.   :493.0   Max.   :66.00
##      NA's    :4
##      bmi      id      ln_bmi      ln_sbp
## Min.   :16.40   Min.   : 1   Min.   :2.797   Min.   :4.382
## 1st Qu.:23.00   1st Qu.:1246 1st Qu.:3.135   1st Qu.:4.754
## Median :25.10   Median :2488 Median :3.223   Median :4.852
## Mean   :25.57   Mean   :2410 Mean   :3.230   Mean   :4.872
## 3rd Qu.:27.80   3rd Qu.:3605 3rd Qu.:3.325   3rd Qu.:4.970
## Max.   :43.40   Max.   :4697 Max.   :3.770   Max.   :5.598
## NA's    :2      NA's    :2
##      ln_scl
## Min.   :4.745
## 1st Qu.:5.283
## Median :5.416
## Mean   :5.410
## 3rd Qu.:5.541
## Max.   :6.201
## NA's    :4
```

There are 4 missing values of scl

There are 2 missing values of bmi, ln\_bmi

There are 4 missing values of ln\_scl

```
library(stargazer)
stargazer::stargazer(framingham, type="text", median=TRUE)
```

```
##
## =====
## Statistic  N      Mean    St. Dev.   Min   Median   Max
## -----
## sbp      1,000  132.350   23.043     80    128    270
## scl       996  227.846   45.087    115    225    493
## age      1,000  45.922    8.545     30     45     66
## bmi       998  25.566    3.848    16.400 25.100 43.400
## id       1,000 2,410.031 1,363.439     1  2,487.5 4,697
## ln_bmi    998   3.230    0.147    2.797   3.223   3.770
## ln_sbp   1,000   4.872    0.163    4.382   4.852   5.598
## ln_scl    996   5.410    0.195    4.745   5.416   6.201
## -----
```

Nicer layout, slightly different info

Examination of the ranges of systolic bp, age, bmi look to be all plausible; no suggestion of significant errors in the data itself.

```
library(summarytools)
summarytools::freq(framingham$sex)

## Frequencies
## framingham$sex
## Type: Factor (unordered)
##
##          Freq  % Valid  % Valid Cum.  % Total  % Total Cum.
## -----
##      Men    443    44.30      44.30    44.30    44.30
##      Women  557    55.70     100.00    55.70   100.00
##      <NA>     0     0.00     100.00    0.00   100.00
##      Total 1000   100.00     100.00   100.00   100.00

library(summarytools)
summarytools::descr(framingham$sbp, stats = c("n.valid", "mean", "sd", "min", "q1", "med", "q3", "max", "CV"),
transpose = TRUE)

## Descriptive Statistics
## framingham$sbp
## N: 1000
##
##          N.Valid  Mean  Std.Dev  Min  Q1  Median  Q3  Max  CV
## -----
##      sbp  1000.00  132.35   23.04  80.00 116.00 128.00 144.00 270.00 0.17
```

Assess Normality of Candidate Dependent Variable = sbp. Shapiro-Wilk Test (Null: normality)  
Histogram w Overlay Normal and QQ Plot

```
options(scipen=1000)
shapiro.test(framingham$sbp)

##
## Shapiro-Wilk normality test
##
## data:  framingham$sbp
## W = 0.92121, p-value < 0.00000000000000022
```

**Interpretation:** The null hypothesis of normality of the distribution of sbp is rejected ( $p < .00001$ )


```
library(ggplot2)
library(gridExtra)
# p1 is panel 1 = histogram w overlay normal

p1 <- ggplot(data=framingham, aes(x=sbp)) +
  geom_histogram(binwidth=5, colour="blue",
    aes(y=..density..)) +
  stat_function(fun=dnorm,
    color="red",
    args=list(mean=mean(framingham$sbp),
      sd=sd(framingham$sbp))) +
  ggtitle("Systolic Blood Pressure (sbp)") +
  xlab("Systolic Blood Pressure (mm Hg)") +
  ylab("Density") +
  theme_bw() +
  theme(axis.text = element_text(size = 10),
    axis.title = element_text(size = 10),
    plot.title = element_text(size = 12))
```



```
# p2 is panel 2 = quantile-quantile plot
p2 <- ggplot(data=framingham, aes(sample=sbp)) +
  stat_qq() +
  geom_abline(intercept=mean(framingham$sbp), slope = sd(framingham$sbp)) +
  ggtitle("Q-Q Plot of Systolic Blood Pressure (sbp)") +
  theme_bw() +
  theme(axis.text = element_text(size = 10),
        axis.title = element_text(size = 10),
        plot.title = element_text(size = 12))

gridExtra::grid.arrange(p1, p2, ncol=2)
```



Interpretation: This confirms what the Shapiro Wilk test suggests. The null hypothesis of normality of the distribution of sbp is not supported.

Create “regression-friendly” indicator variables and interactions. Check.

```
library(summarytools)
library(Hmisc)
# KEY to true/false operator to define indicator:
# If original variable sex="Women" then code new variable female=1. Otherwise, code new variable female=0
# na.rm=TRUE ensures that missing values will not be considered.
framingham$female <- as.numeric(framingham$sex == "Women", na.rm=TRUE)
summarytools::cTable(framingham$sex, framingham$female, prop = 'n', totals = FALSE)

## Cross-Tabulation
## Variables: sex * female
## Data Frame: framingham
##
## -----
##      female      0      1
## sex
## Men      443      0
## Women     0     557
## -----
```

female is the new indicator variable created and is coded 0/1  
sex is the original variable used to create female

It worked!

```
Hmisc::label(framingham$female) <- "female01"


framingham$ageXfemale <- framingham$age*framingham$female
Hmisc::label(framingham$ageXfemale) <- "AGE x FEMALE interaction"

framingham$lnsclXfemale <- framingham$ln_scl*framingham$female
Hmisc::label(framingham$lnsclXfemale) <- "ln(scl) x FEMALE interaction"

framingham$lnbmiXfemale <- framingham$ln_bmi*framingham$female
Hmisc::label(framingham$lnbmiXfemale) <- "ln(bmi) x FEMALE interaction"
```

### Examine Pairwise Relationships: 1) Y with X's; and 2) X's with X's

```
library(GGally)
GGally::ggscatmat(data=framingham,
                  columns=c("ln_sbp", "age", "ln_bmi", "ln_scl")) +
  ggtitle("Framingham Data (n=1000)") +
  theme_bw()
```



Create a dataset that has no missing values on any variables of interest. Name this dataset complete.

Then fit the following five (5) models named as follows

m\_maximal: Contains all predictors

m\_2: Drops 2 interactions - lnbmiXfemale and lnsclXfemale

m\_3: One predictor model w predictor = ln\_bmi

m\_4: One predictor model w predictor = ln\_scl

m\_5: Three predictor model w predictors = age, female, and ageXfemale

```
library(stargazer)
```

```
# KEY to creating a dataset that has NO missing values on any variables of interest
# NEWDATATFRAME <- na.omit(data=SOURCEDATA, cols=c("var","var", ..."var"))
complete <- na.omit(framingham, cols=c("ln_sbp", "ln_bmi", "age", "female", "lnbmiXfemale", "lnsclXfemale", "ageXfemale"))

# Now we can fit the 5 models to the EXACTLY the same observations
m_maximal <- lm(data=complete, ln_sbp ~ ln_bmi + ln_scl + age + female + lnbmiXfemale + lnsclXfemale + ageXfemale)
m_2 <- lm(data=complete, ln_sbp ~ ln_bmi + ln_scl + age + female + ageXfemale)
m_3 <- lm(data=complete, ln_sbp ~ ln_bmi)
m_4 <- lm(data=complete, ln_sbp ~ ln_scl)
m_5 <- lm(data=complete, ln_sbp ~ age + female + ageXfemale)
```

```
# Use command stargazer() in package stargazer to display models side by side
stargazer::stargazer(m_maximal,m_2,m_3,m_4,m_5,type="text",font.size="small", align=TRUE, omit.stat=c("f", "ser"))
```

Dependent variable:					
	(1)	(2)	ln_sbp (3)	(4)	(5)
ln_bmi	0.304*** (0.055)	0.271*** (0.032)	0.388*** (0.033)		
ln_scl	0.059 (0.037)	0.056** (0.025)		0.211*** (0.026)	
age	0.004*** (0.001)	0.004*** (0.001)			0.004*** (0.001)
female	-0.011 (0.304)	-0.217*** (0.051)			-0.327*** (0.051)
lnbmiXfemale	-0.051 (0.067)				
lnsclXfemale	-0.009 (0.050)				
ageXfemale	0.005*** (0.001)	0.005*** (0.001)			0.007*** (0.001)
Constant	3.396*** (0.234)	3.521*** (0.159)	3.618*** (0.106)	3.730*** (0.139)	4.701*** (0.039)
Observations	994	994	994	994	994
R2	0.267	0.266	0.123	0.064	0.203
Adjusted R2	0.261	0.262	0.122	0.063	0.200

Models 1 & 2 have nearly identical R<sup>2</sup> = % variance explained. This suggests the extra predictors in model 1 are not needed. -> Model 2 is preferred (simpler!)

Note: \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01

```
# Use command anova(REducedMODEL, FULLMODEL) to obtain partial F Tests
paste("Partial F-test, 2df: Null: lnbmiXfemale=0 lnsclXfemale=0")
anova(m_2, m_maximal)
```

```
[1] "Partial F-test, 2df: Null: lnbmiXfemale=0 lnsclXfemale=0"
Analysis of Variance Table
```

```
Model 1: ln_sbp ~ ln_bmi + ln_scl + age + female + ageXfemale
Model 2: ln_sbp ~ ln_bmi + ln_scl + age + female + lnbmiXfemale + lnsclXfemale + ageXfemale
```

	Res.Df	RSS	Df	Sum of Sq	F	Pr(>F)
1	988	19.314				
2	986	19.301	2	0.013173	0.3365	0.7144

Interpretation – This confirms that it is okay to DROP lnbmi\_female and lnscl\_female (Partial F = 0.34, p-value = .71) nsSo, model 2 is our "tentative" final model

Further work, regression diagnostics, are needed next (See, section 5. *Goodness-of-Fit and Regression Diagnostics*).

### c. Suggested Criteria for Confounding and Interaction

#### A Suggested Statistical Criterion for Determination of Confounding

A variable Z might be judged to be a confounder of an X-Y relationship if BOTH of the following are satisfied:

- 1) Its inclusion in a model that already contains X as a predictor has adjusted significance level  $< .10$  or  $< .05$ ; *and*
- 2) Its inclusion in the model changes the estimated regression coefficient for X by 15-20% or more, relative to the model that contains only X as a predictor.

#### A Suggested Statistical Criterion for Assessment of Interaction

A “candidate” interaction variable might be judged to be worth retaining in the model if BOTH of the following are satisfied:

- 1) The partial F test for its inclusion has significance level  $< .05$ ; *and*
- 2) Its inclusion in the model alters the estimated regression coefficient for the main effects by 15-20% or more.

## d. Additional Tips for Multivariable Analysis of Large Data Sets

### #1. State the Research Questions.

Aim for a focus that is **explicit, complete, and focused**, including:

- ◆ Statement of population
- ◆ Definition of outcome
- ◆ Specification of hypotheses (predictor-outcome relationships)
- ◆ Identification of (including nature of) hypothesized covariate relationships

### #2. Define the Analysis Variables.

For each research question, note for each analysis variable, its hypothesized role.

- ◆ Outcome
- ◆ Predictor
- ◆ Confounder
- ◆ Effect Modifier
- ◆ Intermediary (also called intervening)

### #3. Prepare a “Clean” Data Set Ready for Analysis (Data Management)

For each variable, check its distribution, especially:

- ◆ Completeness
- ◆ Occurrence of logical errors
- ◆ Within form consistency
- ◆ Between form consistency
- ◆ Range

#### #4. Describe the Analysis Sample

This description serves three purposes:

- 1) Identifies the population actually represented by the sample
- 2) Defines the range(s) of relationships that can be explored
- 3) Identifies, tentatively, the function form of the relationships

##### Methods include:

- ◆ Frequency distributions for discrete variables
- ◆ Mean, standard deviation, percentiles for continuous variables
- ◆ Bar charts
- ◆ Box and whisker plots
- ◆ Scatter plots

#### #5. Assessment of Confounding

The identification of confounders is needed for the correct interpretation of the predictor-outcome relationships. Confounders need to be controlled in analyses of predictor-outcome relationships.

##### Methods include:

- ◆ Cross-tabulations and single predictor regression models to determine whether suspected confounders are predictive of outcome and are related to the predictor of interest.
- ◆ This step should include a determination that there is a confounder-exposure relationship among controls.

#### #6. Single Predictor Regression Model Analyses


The fit of these models identifies the nature and magnitude of crude associations. It also permits assessment of the appropriateness of the assumed functional form of the predictor-outcome relationship.

- ◆ Cross-tabulations
- ◆ Graphical displays (Scatter plots)
- ◆ Estimation of single predictor models

## 5. Goodness-of-Fit and Regression Diagnostics

### a. Introduction and Terminology

Neither prediction nor estimation has meaning when the estimated model is a poor fit to the data:



Our eye “tells” us:

- ◆ A better fitting relationship between X and Y is quadratic
- ◆ We notice different sizes of discrepancies
- ◆ Some observed Y are close to the fitted  $\hat{Y}$  (e.g. near X=1 or X=8)
- ◆ Other observed Y are very far from the fitted  $\hat{Y}$  (e.g. near X=5)

Poor fits of the data to a fitted line can occur for several reasons and can occur even when the fitted line explains a large proportion ( $R^2$ ) of the total variability in response:

- ◆ The wrong functional form (link function) was fit.
- ◆ Extreme values (outliers) exhibit uniquely large discrepancies between observed and fitted values.
- ◆ One or more important explanatory variables have been omitted.
- ◆ One or more model assumptions have been violated.

Consequences of a poor fit include:

- ◆ We learn the wrong biology.
- ◆ Comparison of group differences aren't "fair" because they are unduly influenced by a minority.
- ◆ Comparison of group means aren't "fair" because we used the wrong standard error.
- ◆ Predictions are wrong because the fitted model does not apply to the case of interest.

Available techniques of goodness-of-fit assessment are of two types:

1. **Systematic** - those that explore the appropriateness of the model itself

*Have we fit the correct model?*

*Should we fit another model?*

2. **Case Analysis** – those that investigate the influence of individual data points

*Are there a small number of individuals whose inclusion in the analysis influences excessively the choice of the fitted model?*






## Goodness-of-Fit Assessment Some Terminology - continued

### Case Analysis


<b>Residual:</b>	<p>The residual is the difference between the observed outcome <math>Y</math> and the fitted outcome <math>\hat{Y}</math>.</p> $e = [Y - \hat{Y}]$ <p>It estimates the unobservable error <math>\varepsilon</math>.</p>
<b>Outlier:</b>	<p>An outlier is a residual that is <u>unusually</u> large.</p> <p><i>Note:</i> As before, we will rescale the sizes of the residuals via standardization so that we can interpret their magnitudes on the scale of SE units.</p>
<b>Leverage:</b>	<p>The leverage is a measure of the unusualness of the value of the predictor <math>X</math>.</p> <p>Leverage = distance (observed <math>X</math>, center of <math>X</math> in sample)</p> <p>Predictor values with high leverages have, potentially, a large influence on the choice of the fitted model.</p>
<b>Influence:</b>	<p>Measures of influence gauge the change in the fitted model with the omission of the data point.</p> <p><b>Example: Cook's Distance</b></p>

# A Feel for Residual, Leverage, Influence Large residuals may or may not be influential



Large residual  
Low leverage

The large residual effects a large influence.




Large residual  
Low leverage

Despite its size, the large residual effects only small influence.


## A Feel for Residual, Leverage, Influence

### High leverage may or may not be influential



High leverage  
Small residual

The high leverage effects a large influence.



High leverage  
Small residual

Despite its size, the large leverage effects only small influence.

Thus, case analysis is needed to discover all of:

- ◆ high leverage
- ◆ large residuals
- ◆ large influence

## Overview of Techniques of Goodness-of-Fit Assessment Linear Model


	Question Addressed	Procedure
<b>Systematic Component</b>	<u>Error Distribution:</u> Is it reasonable to assume a normal distribution of errors with a constant variance?  $H_0: E \sim \text{Normal}(0, \sigma^2)$	Shapiro-Wilk test of normality  Cook-Weisberg test of heteroscedasticity
	<u>Functional Form:</u> Is the choice of functional form relating the predictors to outcome a “good” one?	Method of fractional polynomials.
	<u>Systematic Violation:</u> Have we failed to include any important explanatory (predictor) variables?	Ramsey Test for omitted variables.
<b>Case Analysis</b>	Are there outliers with respect to the <u>outcome</u> values?	Studentized residuals
	Are there outliers with respect to the <u>predictor</u> variable values?	Leverage
	Are there individual observations with unduly large influence on the fitted model?	Cook’s distance (influence)

## b. Assessment of Normality

Recall what we are assuming with respect to normality:

- **Simple Linear Regression:**  
At each level “ $x$ ” of the predictor variable  $X$ , the outcomes  $Y_x$  are distributed **normal** with mean  $= \mu_{Y|x} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x$  and constant variance  $\sigma_{Y|x}^2$
- **Multiple Linear Regression:**  
At each vector level “ $\underline{x} = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_p]$ ” of the predictor vector  $\underline{X}$ , the outcomes  $Y_{\underline{x}}$  are distributed **normal** with mean  $= \mu_{Y|\underline{x}} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \dots + \beta_p x_p$  and constant variance  $\sigma_{Y|\underline{x}}^2$

*This is what it looks like (courtesy of a picture on the web!)*



**Violations of Normality are sometimes, but not always, a serious problem**

- **When not to worry:** Estimation and hypothesis tests of regression parameters are fairly robust to modest violations of normality
- **When to worry:** Predictions are sensitive to violations of normality
- **Beware:** Sometimes the cure for violations of normality is worse than the problem.

Some graphical assessments of normality and what to watch out for:

Method	What to watch out for:
1. Histogram of outcome variable Y and/or Histogram of residuals	Look for normal shape of the histogram.
2. Histogram of residuals (or studentized or jackknife residuals)	Look for normal shape of the histogram.
3. Quantile quantile plot of the quantiles of the residuals versus the quantiles of the assumed normal distribution of the residuals.	Normally distributed residuals will appear, approximately, linear.

Two Panel Graph: 1) Histogram w Overlay Normal + 2) QQ plot

# Tip- Might want to tweak binwidth

```
library(ggplot2)
```

```
library(gridExtra)
```

# Left Panel


# ggplot(data= DATAFRAME, aes(x=VARIABLENAME)) + stuff below

```
p1 <- ggplot(data=framingham, aes(x=ln_sbp)) +
  geom_histogram(binwidth=.05, colour="blue",
    aes(y=..density..)) +
  stat_function(fun=dnorm,
    color="red",
    args=list(mean=mean(framingham$ln_sbp),
      sd=sd(framingham$ln_sbp))) +
  ggtitle("Histogram of ln_sbp w Overlay Normal") +
  xlab("ln_sbp") +
  ylab("Density") +
  theme_bw() +
  theme(axis.text = element_text(size = 9),
    axis.title = element_text(size = 9),
    plot.title = element_text(size = 10))
```

# Right Panel

```
p2 <- ggplot(data=framingham, aes(sample=ln_sbp)) +
  stat_qq() +
  geom_abline(intercept=mean(framingham$ln_sbp), slope = sd(framingham$ln_sbp)) +
  ggtitle("Q-Q Plot of ln[Systolic Blood Pressure (ln_sbp)]") +
  theme_bw() +
  theme(axis.text = element_text(size = 9),
    axis.title = element_text(size = 9),
    plot.title = element_text(size = 10))
```

```
gridExtra::grid.arrange(p1, p2, ncol=2)
```



### Skewness and Kurtosis Statistics for Assessing Normality:

	What to watch out for:
<p><b>Skewness</b> - <b>symmetry</b> of the curve</p> <p>Standardization of the 3<sup>rd</sup> sample moment about the mean</p> $m_2 = E \left[ (Y - \mu)^2 \right]$ $m_3 = E \left[ (Y - \mu)^3 \right]$ <p>What is actually examined is <math>a_3 = \frac{m_3}{(m_2)^{3/2}}</math></p> <p>because it is unitless</p> <p><math>a_3 = 0</math> indicates symmetry</p> <p><math>a_3 &lt; 0</math> indicates lefthand skew (tail to left)</p> <p><math>a_3 &gt; 0</math> indicates right hand skew (tail to right)</p>	<p>When <i>yvariable</i> is distributed normal:</p> <p>Skewness = 0</p> <p><b>Look for</b> skewness between -2 and +2, roughly.</p>
<p><b>Kurtosis</b> – <b>flatness versus peakedness</b> of the curve</p> <p>Standardization of the 4<sup>th</sup> sample moment about the mean</p>	<p>When <i>yvariable</i> is distributed normal:</p> <p>Kurtosis = 3</p>



$m_2 = E \left[ (Y - \mu)^2 \right]$ $m_4 = E \left[ (Y - \mu)^4 \right]$ <p>Pearson kurtosis is <math>a_4 = \frac{m_4}{(m_2)^2}</math></p> <p><math>a_4 = 3</math> when distribution is normal</p> <p><math>a_4 &lt; 3</math> is “leptokurtic” is too little in the tails</p> <p><math>a_4 &gt; 3</math> is “platykurtic” is too much in the tails</p>	
---	--

### Hypothesis Tests of Normality and what to watch out for:

Test Statistic	What to watch out for:
<p>1. <u>Shapiro Wilk (W)</u></p> <p>W is a measure of the correlation between the values in the sample and their associated normal scores (for review of Normal Scores, see BE540 Topic 5 – Normal Distribution)</p> <p>W = 1 under normality</p>	<p>Null Hypothesis <math>H_0</math>: <i>yvariable</i> is distributed normal: Alternative Hypothesis <math>H_A</math>: Not.</p> <p>Evidence of violation of normality is reflected in</p> <p>W &lt; 1 small p-value</p>
<p>2. <u>Kolmogorov-Smirnov (D)</u>. See also <u>Lilliefors (K-S)</u></p> <p>This is a goodness of fit test that compares the distribution of the residuals to that of a reference normal distribution using a chi square test.</p> <p>Lilliefors utilizes a correction</p>	<p>Evidence of violation of normality is reflected in</p> <p>D &gt; 0</p> <p>K-S &gt; 0</p> <p>small p-value</p>

### Guidelines

In practice, the assessment of normality is made after assessment of other model assumption violations.

The linear model is often more robust to violations of the assumption of normality.

The cure, is often worse than the problem. (e.g. – transformation of the outcome variable)

Consider doing a scatterplot of the residuals. Look for

- ◆ Bell shaped pattern
- ◆ Center at zero
- ◆ No gross outliers

### c. Cook-Weisberg Test of Heteroscedasticity

Recall what we are assuming with respect to homogeneity of variance:

- **In Simple Linear Regression:**  
At each level “x” of the predictor variable X, the outcomes Y are distributed normal with mean  $\mu_{Y|x} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x$  and **constant variance**  $\sigma_{Y|x}^2$

Evidence of a **violation** of homogeneity (this is heteroscedasticity) is seen when

- There is increasing or decreasing variation in the residuals with fitted  $\hat{Y}$
- There is increasing or decreasing variation in the residuals with predictor X

Some **graphical assessments** of homogeneity of variance and what to watch out for:

Method	What to watch out for:
1. Plot Residuals or standardized residuals or studentized residuals on the vertical  – versus –  Predicted outcomes $\hat{Y}$ on the horizontal	Look for even band at zero
2. Plot Residuals or standardized residuals or studentized residuals on the vertical  – versus –  Predictor values X	Look for even band at zero

### Hypothesis Test of homogeneity of variance is Cook-Weisberg

Cook-Weisberg Test	What to watch out for:
This test is based on a model of the variance as a function of the fitted values (or the predictor X). Specifically, it is a chi square test of whether the squared standardized residuals are linearly related to the fitted values (or the predictor X).	Evidence of violation of homogeneity of variance is reflected in  Large test statistic > 0 small p-value

### d. The Method of Fractional Polynomials

This method is beyond the scope of this course. However, it's helpful to understand the ideas.

Goal: The goal is to select a “good” functional form that relates Y to X from a collection of candidate models. Candidates are lower polynomials and members of the Box-Tidwell family.

Fractional Polynomials: Instead of  $Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X$ , we consider the following:

Instead of fitting a  
**simple linear relationship** of the form  
 $\beta_1 X$

We consider fitting a  
**fractional polynomial relationship** of the form  
 $\beta_1 X^{p_1} + \beta_2 X^{p_2} + \beta_3 X^{p_3} + \dots + \beta_m X^{p_m}$

where

**m** = number of powers (“degree”)

**p<sub>1</sub>, p<sub>2</sub>, p<sub>3</sub>, ..., p<sub>m</sub>** are choices from a special set of 8 candidate powers = { -2, -1, -0.5, 0, 0.5, 1, 2, 3 }

And where, when powers repeat

E.g. - when **p<sub>2</sub> = p<sub>1</sub>** we consider  $\beta_1 X^{p_1} + \beta_2 X^{p_1} \ln(X)$  .

**Example:** Suppose **m=1** with **p<sub>1</sub> = 1** . This yields

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X$$

**Example:** Next, suppose **m=2** with **p<sub>1</sub> = 0.5** and **p<sub>2</sub> = 0.5**. Because **p<sub>2</sub> = p<sub>1</sub>** this yields

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \sqrt{X} + \beta_2 \sqrt{X} \ln(X)$$

## The Method of Fractional Polynomials - Continued

### Guidelines

Competing models are assessed using a chi square statistic that compares the likelihoods of the data under each of the two models using what is called a “deviance” statistic.

*Don't worry:* We will learn about the “deviance” statistic in BIOSTATS 640 Unit 5 in the context of the logistic regression model.

Search begins with examination of all models for which  $m=1$ . We choose the one model in this class that has the smallest deviance.

- ◆ We compare the best  $m=1$  model to the specific model for which  $m=1$  and  $p_1=1$  because the latter is the simple linear model.
- ◆ Thus, we are asking whether it is really necessary to abandon the simple linear model.

Next, we compare the best  $m=1$  model to the best  $m=2$  model. And so on ...

- ◆ In general, we must choose between two costs:
  - 1) A smaller model has a lower goodness-of-fit but more generalizability
  - 2) A larger model has a higher goodness-of-fit but less generalizability
- ◆ Our goal is to choose the smallest model for which the goodness-of-fit is acceptable.

### e. Ramsey Test for Omitted Variables

A fitted model that fails to include an important explanatory variable is problematic.

- ◆ Our understanding of the outcomes is incomplete.
- ◆ Estimated associations may be biased due to confounding.
- ◆ Model assumptions may be violated.

#### Method of the Ramsey Test

- ◆  $H_0$ : Predicted values from the fitted model are unrelated to powers of the fitted model, after adjustment for the predictor variables in the model.

$$\text{corr}(\hat{Y}, \hat{Y}^p) = 0$$

- ◆ For example, we might fit the model  $\hat{Y} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \hat{Y} + \beta_2 \hat{Y}^2 + \beta_3 X + \text{error}$  and test the significance of  $\hat{\beta}_1$  and  $\hat{\beta}_2$ .
- ◆ The test statistic is an F statistic.

#### Guidelines

Evidence of a failure to include one or more explanatory variables is reflected in a large F statistic value.

As a suggestion, do also a scatterplot of the squared standardized residuals versus the leverage values. Omission of an important explanatory variables is suggested by

- ◆ Extreme values
- ◆ Any systematic pattern

## f. Residuals, Leverage, and Cook's Distance

**Residuals** - There are multiple measures of “residual”.

<b>Ordinary residual</b> $e = (Y - \hat{Y})$	<b>Standardized residual</b> $e^* = \frac{e}{\sqrt{ms(residual)}} = \frac{e}{\sqrt{\hat{\sigma}_{Y x}^2}}$
<b>Studentized residual</b> $e^* = \frac{e}{\sqrt{ms(residual)}\sqrt{1-h}} = \frac{e}{\sqrt{\hat{\sigma}_{Y x}^2}\sqrt{1-h}}$	<b>Jackknife residual, also called Studentized deleted residual</b> $e^* = \frac{e}{\sqrt{ms(residual)_{-i}}\sqrt{1-h}} = \frac{e}{\sqrt{\hat{\sigma}_{Y jk}^2}\sqrt{1-h}}$

Which one or ones should we use?

- **Standardized** residuals can be appreciated as we do z-scores.
- **Studentized** residuals are distributed Student's t (df=n-p-1) when regression assumptions hold.
- **Jackknife** residuals are distributed Student's t (df=n-p-2) when regression assumptions hold. These also have the advantage of correcting the magnitude of the  $\sqrt{MS(residual)}$  when it is otherwise too big because of the effects of influential points.

## Leverage, $h_i$ :

Leverage is the distance of a predictor value  $X=x$  from the center of the values of the predictor value  $X = \bar{x}$ . This distance is denoted  $h_i$ .

For simple linear regression, 
$$h_i = \frac{1}{n} + \frac{(x_i - \bar{x})^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}$$

For simple linear regression, a “large” leverage value is  $h_i \geq \frac{4}{n}$

### Cook's Distance, d

Recall from our pictures that neither a large residual alone nor a high leverage determine the influence of an individual data point.

Cook's distance provides a measure of the influence of an individual data point on the fitted model and is a function of the values of both the residual and leverage:

Cook's Distance = Change in estimated regression coefficient  
value, expressed in standard error units.

1) For simple linear regression 
$$d = \frac{e^2 h}{2s^2(1-h)^2}$$

2) For multivariable linear regression models 
$$d_i = \frac{(\hat{\beta}_{-i} - \hat{\beta})' (X'X) (\hat{\beta}_{-i} - \hat{\beta})}{p' s_{Y|X}^2}$$

where

$i$  indexes the individual for which measure of influence is sought

$\hat{\beta}$  = vector of estimated regression coefficients using the entire sample

$\hat{\beta}_{-i}$  = vector of estimated regression coefficients with omission of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  data point

$X$  = matrix of values of the predictor variables

$p'$  = rank ( $X$ ) = number of predictors + 1

### Guidelines

- ◆ For the linear regression model, a “noteworthy” influential data point is one for which  $d \geq 1$ .

For a multivariable regression model, a “noteworthy” influential data point is one for which  $d \geq 2(p+1)/n$  where  $p$ =# predictors.

## g. Example


### Framingham Study – model #2

Plot of Observed v Predicted. Look for: Points along a straight line (“all is well”)

```
library(ggplot2)
library(Hmisc)

m_best <- lm(data=complete, ln_sbp ~ ln_bmi + ln_scl + age + female + ageXfemale) # Fit model
complete$yhat <- predict(m_best) # Add predicted values to dataset
Hmisc::label(complete$yhat) <- "Predicted ln(sbp)"

ggplot(data=complete, aes(x=ln_sbp,y=yhat)) +
  geom_smooth(method=lm, se=FALSE) + # TIP - plot line first
  geom_point() + # Then plot your points on top
  xlab("Observed ln_sbp") +
  ylab("Predicted ln_sbp") +
  ggtitle("Framingham Regression of ln_sbp (Model #2)") +
  theme_bw()
```




Interpretation – Not bad! Ideally, the scatter lies on the line defined by 45 degrees. We expect some widening of the confidence intervals at the ends of the range but not too much. What we see here is reasonable.



# Normality of Residuals – QQ Plot and Shapiro Wilk Test. Null: Normality (“all is well”)

```
library(ggplot2)
complete$residuals <- residuals(m_best) # Add the residuals to the dataset

ggplot(data=complete, aes(sample=residuals)) +
  stat_qq() +
  geom_abline(intercept=mean(complete$residuals),
              slope = sd(complete$residuals)) +
  ggtitle("Q-Q Plot of Residuals (model #2)") +
  theme_bw() +
  theme(axis.text = element_text(size = 9),
        axis.title = element_text(size = 9),
        plot.title = element_text(size = 10))
```



```
options(scipen=1000)
shapiro.test(complete$residuals)

##
##  Shapiro-Wilk normality test
##
## data:  complete$residuals
## W = 0.9775, p-value = 0.00000000028
```

Interpretation – Here too, we hope to see a scatter on the 45 degree line. Not bad!

## Ramsay Test of Omitted Variables. Null: No omissions (“all is well”)

```
library(lmtest)
lmtest::resettest(m_best, power=2, type="regressor")
## RESET test
##
## data: m_best
## RESET = 0.42467, df1 = 5, df2 = 983, p-value = 0.8317
```

Interpretation – Ramsey test is NOT significant ( $p=0.83$ ) suggesting we’re okay!

## Assessment of Multicollinearity (“all is well” if VIF < 10)

```
library(car)
car::vif(m_best)

##      ln_bmi      ln_scl      age      female ageXfemale
## 1.115511 1.175531 2.378150 32.394888 34.116761
```

Interpretation – female and ageXfemale appear to be collinear suggesting some concern about the extent to which there is adequacy of range of age in the 2 genders.

## Cook’s Distances (flag observations for which Cook distance > $4/(n-p-1)$ . Other definitions possible.

```
library(Hmisc)
library(ggplot2)
complete$ID <- as.numeric(row.names(complete)) # Create ID variable and add it to the dataset
Hmisc::label(complete$ID) <- "Observation Number"

complete$cooks <- cooks.distance(m_best) # Add cooks distances to the dataset

cutoff <- 4/((nrow(complete)-length(m_best$coefficients)-2)) # Solve for cutoff as equal to = 4 / (n-p-1).

ggplot(data=complete, aes(x=ID, y=cooks)) +
  geom_bar(stat="identity", position="identity") +
  xlab("Observation Number") +
  ylab("Cooks Distance") +
  geom_hline(yintercept=cutoff) +
  geom_text(aes(label=ifelse((cooks>cutoff), ID, "")), ID, "", vjust=-0.2, hjust=0.5) +
  ggtitle("Cooks Distances > 4 / (n-p-1)") +
  theme_bw()
```

